

Combined minutes of meetings between Bayside City Council Officers and Pennydale Residents Action Group on 9 July, 25 July and 8 August 2018.



Minutes of the Meeting of Bayside City Council and Pennydale Residents Action Group

held in at Bayside Corporate Centre, 76 Royal Avenue,
Sandringham
on Monday 9 July 2018

The Meeting commenced at 2:00pm

PRESENT:

Hamish Reid	Director City Planning and Community Services
Juliana Aya	Manager Urban Strategy
Katanya Barlow	Principal Strategic Planner
Julia Weyhe	Senior Strategic Planner
Greg Scott	Pennydale Residents Action Group (PRAG)
Derek Screen	Pennydale Residents Action Group (PRAG)
Patricia Smyth	Pennydale Residents Action Group (PRAG)
Robert Saunders	Pennydale Residents Action Group (PRAG)

Table of Contents

1.	General	
2.	Precincts / Schedules	
	a) Limit Precinct 1 to Bay Road (remove Park Road).....	3
	b) Laneway no longer feasible (372 & 378-382 Bay Road) or supported by community	3
	c) Front setbacks on Bay Road should be larger.....	4
3.	Precinct 2/GRZ11: (Tulip Grove): Not appropriate	
4.	Precinct 3/GRZ9: Accepted on conditions met	
5.	Precinct 4/C1Z: Acceptable	
6.	New Precinct proposed for Park Road (Precinct 5) based on GRZ11	
7.	New Precinct proposed for Jack Road / Laminex interface based on GRZ11	
8.	Future Moderate Residential Growth Area (FMRGAs)	
9.	Front setbacks	
10.	Traffic study	
11.	Open space and connectivity	
12.	The Vision	

Significant issues/recommendations of PRAG

1. General

- a) PRAG recommendation: Confirm that the MAC boundary is at the railway line.

Officer response:

Confirmed.

- b) PRAG recommendation: Confirm that 50% site coverage will remain across Pennydale.

Officer Response:

Confirmed.

2. Precincts/Schedules

- a) PRAG recommendation: Limit Precinct 1 to Bay Road (remove Park Road). PRAG recommends that Park and Bay Road are separate precincts as they have different characteristics (width of street, north vs. south facing).

Officer response:

This recommendation will be considered further and discussed at the next meeting.

- b) PRAG Feedback: Laneway no longer feasible (372 & 378-382 Bay Road) or supported by community. None of the existing residents wish to sell and a significant number are now in their forever homes.

Katanya Barlow asked PRAG members to clarify why the PRAG consider the laneway is not feasible. Katanya Barlow also explained that the aim of the laneway was to reduce traffic entering Bay Road from many cross overs. This would still be achieved if only part of laneway delivered (eg. laneway that connects to Munro Avenue or Davie Avenue)

PRAG members clarified, the issue of concern is traffic congestion on the side roads, Mernda Avenue, Munro Avenue, Davie Avenue, that would be caused by traffic access/egress from and into a laneway. PRAG members also clarified that the community opposed this laneway as a stealth access from Siede Court and Tulip Grove to Bay road via Davie Avenue. PRAG also clarified that the existing laneway for shops is different and no other area can be found with a new residential laneway in existing residential area. PRAG also clarified that the existing laneway is dangerous without lighting and safety issues around a new laneway is paramount in the thoughts of residents. PRAG also clarified that in order to attain a laneway council would have to give back to the developers by smaller front setbacks which the residents are against.

PRAG recommendation:

Remove reference to a laneway in Precinct 1 from the Structure Plan.

Officer response:

This recommendation will be considered further and discussed at the next meeting. There was no intention that this laneway be a stealth access from Siede Court to Bay Road.

- c) PRAG Feedback: Front setbacks on Bay Road should be larger. A larger setback provides more space for canopy trees to be planted and better aligns with the current character of Bay Road. Setbacks should allow for existing neighbourhood character to continue – we do not want a canyon effect or a zigzag effect with some properties setback further than others. Do not want 3 storey streetwalls – not existing or preferred neighbourhood character. 3 storey streetwalls are located in existing commercial areas such as Bay road shops which include greater setback and parking from the street. This precinct is purely a residential one not a commercial one and as such the residences should adhere to existing character and setbacks with a 2 storey max street wall and recessed 3rd storey which is what is already happening in the Bay road shops anyway.

PRAG recommendation:

Alter the setbacks in Precinct 1 to 6m or 9m front setbacks (preferably 9m).

Officer Response:

This recommendation will be considered further and discussed at the next meeting.

3. Precinct 2/GRZ11 (Tulip Grove): not appropriate

Katanya Barlow asked PRAG members to clarify what is inappropriate about Precinct 2.

PRAG response:

- Traffic congestion and lots of accidents already occur in the area, so more development here would increase this.
- There is less patronage than expected using Southland station.
- If the opening doesn't occur – then precinct 3 is the right precinct, no guarantee that the additional opening will ever occur. PTV focus has now shifted to Cheltenham where a much higher patronage and cost of construction is more important.
- Following from this traffic lights at the Tulip Grove and Park Road intersection are not needed.

PRAG recommendation:

Incorporate Precinct 2 into Precinct 3 (i.e remove apartment typology).

Officer response:

This recommendation will be considered further and discussed at the next meeting.

4. Precinct 3/GRZ9: Accepted on conditions met

PRAG members: Vegetation Protection Overlay should be extended to Pennydale, and in particular the core.

Katanya Barlow: explained that a VPO is not justified on biodiversity grounds, but that the Neighbourhood Character Review will look at Pennydale and whether a VPO is justified on neighbourhood character grounds.

Juliana Aya: if clear objectives in relation to vegetation are included within the Pennydale Structure Plan this will assist to inform the Neighbourhood Character Review work and respond to the community aspirations for the future character of Pennydale.

PRAG members: Since the work has already been done, there should not be a reason to wait until a Neighbourhood Character study is done – the 2 items are completely separate and different.

PRAG members: Canopy trees should be at least 2 metres when planted and that many residents are happy with apartments if setbacks are large enough. PRAG also advised that more than 100 canopy trees have been allowed to be removed over past 20 years and there is no Council program to verify newly planted canopy trees or other vegetation is in fact growing and viable after a permit for development is approved.

More wording should be transferred from Bayside's Neighbourhood Character policy - H5 'preferred future neighbourhood character' – into the draft Schedules to the General Residential Zone.

Must specify retention of "the areas largely one and two storey character..."

PRAG recommendations:

- Continue to pursue a Vegetation Protection Overlay for the area.
- Encourage planting of trees in front setbacks.
- More wording should be transferred from Bayside's neighbourhood character policy - H5 'preferred future neighbourhood character' into the draft Schedules to the General Residential Zone.
- Must specify retention of "the areas largely one and two storey character..."

Officer response:

- **A VPO is not justified on biodiversity grounds. The Neighbourhood Character Review will look at Pennydale and whether a VPO is justified on landscape character/neighbourhood character grounds. Investigating the feasibility of introducing a Vegetation Protection**

Overlay will continue to be included in the final Structure Plan and will be in the Implementation Plan.

- Officers will supply a word version of the Draft Schedules so PRAG members can present their suggestions for wording of neighbourhood character protection and landscape requirements.
- Officers will review these draft schedules and discuss them at the next meeting.

5. Precinct 4/C1Z: Acceptable

- Site of significant development opportunity
- Issues currently being addressed in C126

Officer response:

Noted. No further action.

6. New Precinct proposed for Park Road (Precinct 5) based on GRZ11

- Introduce a new Precinct solely for Park Road as it has very different neighbourhood character to Bay Road (North facing).
- Largely treed environment, significant historical homes.
- Working with the natural gradient, reset the precinct boundary to the boundary between 119 & 121 Park Road (back to the railway).

PRAG recommendations:

- Retain the neighbourhood character and avenue nature of Park Road as a 'gateway boulevard' to the Bayside sand belt area.
- More wording needed in the Structure Plan about the importance of Cheltenham Park.
- 2 storey street wall height (3rd storey recessed).
- Retain 9m front setbacks.
- Give more consideration to how pedestrians get to Cheltenham Park from Pennydale. Connection to Cheltenham Park and the South side of Park Road.

Officer response:

- This item will be further discussed at the next meeting after more consideration by officers.
- More wording about Cheltenham Park and the importance of connectivity can be added to the Structure Plan.
- The street wall height and setbacks need to be considered. This will be discussed at the next meeting.

7. New Precinct proposed for Jack Road / Laminex interface based on GRZ11

- For future consideration.
- Include recreational space.

Officer response:

Noted. No further action.

8. Future Moderate Residential Growth Area (FMRGAs)

PRAG: This term has never been mentioned before, can you please clarify what it means.

Katanya Barlow explained:

- This term is in current Planning scheme.
- All General Residential Zone areas are referred to as Moderate or Future Moderate Residential Growth Areas (FMRGA).
- Confirmed that if the height is locked in the Schedule to the Zone then that is the height. The FMRGA is an overarching term – the GRZ schedule controls the height.

PRAG recommendation:

Please add wording around FMRGAs clarifying that “although Pennydale is not an Activity Centre it is a Future Moderate Residential Growth Area, etc”

Officer Response:

Include more explanation in Structure Plan of what Future Moderate Residential Growth Area means.

9. Front setbacks

- Accept side & rear setbacks
- Concern with 3m front setbacks, particularly parking across crossovers as well as planting of canopy trees and neighbourhood character.
- Must retain 9m front setbacks on Park Road given depth of blocks

Officer response:

Noted. Request for alteration to Park Road setback will be considered and discussed at the next meeting.

10. Traffic study

PRAG members feel the current traffic study was not sufficient for the purposes of the Structure Plan.

PRAG recommendation:

- Undertake an additional traffic study with a focus on Bay Road and the impacts of the LXRA level crossing removal (once it is complete).
- Planning for Pennydale section of Bay Road needs to be integrated with Southland and Sandringham sections
- Support for traffic lights at Bay Road and Jack Road intersection needs further analysis as resident opinion remains unclear. This will also depend on future treatment of Bay Rd/Graham Rd intersection
- Bike lanes on Bay Road are too dangerous. PRAG alternative suggestions:
- Pennydale to Sandringham –
 - Option 1: Talinga Road, Spring Street, Royal Ave
 - Option 2: Tulip or Graham.
 - South – Get to Bay Trail through Golf Course to Weatherall Road.
 - Suggestion: Use Park Road instead. Just needs more wayfinding signage.

Officer response:

- **Consider altering the wording around the traffic management options to be less specific. For example instead of “proposed traffic light” may be possible to have “potential pedestrian crossing point”. Officers will consider this and discuss the solution with the PRAG members at the next meeting.**
- **Bay Road Bike lane is identified as part of the state-wide Strategic Cycling Network by VicRoads. Officers will discuss this further with VicRoads. Will consider alternative cycling path options as per PRAG recommendations. This will be discussed with Council’s Transport Planning officer before the next meeting.**

11. Open space and connectivity

PRAG recommendations:

- Need more reference to Cheltenham Park. Need signalised pedestrian crossings to be at the right points to link up with footpaths e.g the Tulip Grove and Jack Road crossings.
- Need more of a mobility focus for connectivity for mobility impaired.
- Foot access rather than road access – opposite 119 Park Road.
- Access to Sir William Fry is ideally an overpass pedestrian bridge – may be included in LXRA works connecting Heather Grove to Southland Station.

Officer response:

- **More references to Cheltenham Park can be added.**
- **Will investigate mobility shortfalls and improvement options before next meeting.**

- Will consider changing access point in plan to align with pedestrian access to Cheltenham Park.
- Structure Plan includes strategy to advocate for pedestrian access to better connect the train station to Bay Road. Rework to include better connections to Sir William Fry and include reference to a pedestrian overpass bridge.

12. The Vision

PRAG recommendation:

- The proposed vision does not align with community sentiment and Community Advisory Group's vision as contained in the final recommendation report.
- The wording should be altered to remove 'range of housing'

Officer response:

- Important that Vision is realistic. Reality is that 3 storey dwellings can be built throughout Pennydale. Will re-examine the Community Advisory Group's vision statement to see if it can include more similarities.
- Providing a range of housing for different members of the community (small families, large families, different life stages etc.) is important. Look at how to better explain what a 'range of housing' means.

END OF MINUTES



Minutes of the Meeting of Bayside City Council and Pennydale Residents Action Group

held in at Bayside Corporate Centre, 76 Royal Avenue,
Sandringham
on Monday 25 July 2018

The Meeting commenced at 2:00pm

PRESENT:

Hamish Reid	Director City Planning and Community Services
Juliana Aya	Manager Urban Strategy
Katanya Barlow	Principal Strategic Planner
Greg Scott	Pennydale Residents Action Group (PRAG)
Derek Screen	Pennydale Residents Action Group (PRAG)
Robert Saunders	Pennydale Residents Action Group (PRAG)

APOLOGIES

Julia Weyhe	Senior Strategic Planner, Bayside City Council
Patricia Smyth	Pennydale Residents Action Group (PRAG)

Table of Contents

1. Minutes of previous meeting.
2. Response to issues raised at meeting of 9th July 2018.
3. Next Steps

1. Minutes of Previous Meeting

Confirmation of minutes. Agreed by all. To be circulated to interested parties and be made available on the Have Your Say website.

2. Response to issues raised at meeting of 9th July 2018

Katanya Barlow took the group through Attachment 2 - Response to issues raised at meeting of 9th July 2018.

PRAG response to officer proposals in table:

- 1) All in agreeance that the MAC boundary has been moved to the Railway line and no further action is required.
- 2) Officers have agreed to amend vision to
*'A family-friendly neighbourhood with green and leafy streets, access to excellent transport, shopping and open spaces, with a range of **medium density** housing to meet the needs of a range of demographics and life stages, while retaining the area's valued neighbourhood character and amenity.'*

In order to make it clear that high density housing is not appropriate for the area.

Action: Officers to draft wording for Structure Plan.

- 3) Officers outlined that they are not willing to specify retention of one and two storey character in the Vision as 3 storeys is already allowed throughout Pennydale. There is reference in the Structure Plan to the existing 1 and 2 storey character of the area on pg 14 of the Structure Plan. PRAG members agreed to this.
- 4) All in agreeance on 50% site coverage.
- 5) Agreeance on new precinct for Park Road. However no agreement reached regarding a 3 storey street wall or the precinct boundary. PRAG members believe it does not achieve the outcomes they are seeking in responding to community aspirations for this precinct. Main concern with 3 storey street wall is that this type of built form, when built adjacent to heritage buildings, will detract from the heritage building. Also concerned about the impact on the character and amenity of the Park Road, currently heavily greened front yards with canopy trees and appropriate setbacks. Also concerned about the impact of development on Park Road on properties on Churchill Avenue.

Katanya Barlow suggested addition of wording to Structure Plan around ensuring development is respectful of and does not detract from any adjacent heritage building. Rear setbacks are designed to limit amenity impacts on Churchill Avenue and perhaps could look at encouraging planting in rear setbacks to screen apartment buildings.

Action: Officers to draft wording for Structure Plan.
PRAG representatives to consider further and respond once seen wording in revised Structure Plan.

- 6) All in agreeance that reference to laneway behind residential properties in Precinct 1 will be removed from the Structure Plan. For consistency, the strategy encouraging laneway access for new developments along Bay Road will also be removed from the Highett Structure Plan

Action: Officers to draft wording for Structure Plan.

- 7) All in agreeance that setbacks in Precinct 1 will be increased from 3 metres to 6 metres. In addition, consider wording to ensure tree canopy is provided within the setback.

Action: Officers to draft wording for Structure Plan.

- 8) All in agreeance that Precinct 2 will be removed (incorporated into Precinct 3). Include an additional Strategy in the Structure Plan, that should an additional station entrance open from Tulip Grove, a review of Precinct 2 of the Structure Plan will be triggered.

Action: Officers to draft wording for Structure Plan.

- 9) All in agreeance that a Vegetation Protection Overlay on landscape character/neighbourhood character grounds will be a investigated as a specific action in the Implementation Plan. Important to make sure wording in Structure Plan is consistent with wording in Highett Structure Plan.

Action: Officers to check wording is consistent with Highett Structure Plan.

- 10) All in agreeance that the Schedules must be written in a way to encourage planting of trees.

Action: Officers to review draft Schedules.

- 11) All in agreeance with the inclusion of the H5 Heritage Policy design guidelines as a decision guideline in the Draft GRZ9 Schedule (Precinct 3).

Action: Officers to amend Draft GRZ9 accordingly.

- 12) All in agreeance to specifying the character of Park Road as a gateway boulevard.

Action: Officers to draft wording for Structure Plan.
PRAG to provide feedback on proposed precinct description once they have seen revised Structure Plan.

- 13) All in agreeance to add an additional dot-point under Objective 09 to investigate options for improving pedestrian connectivity, safety and access to the entrance to Cheltenham Park.

PRAG reinforced that the wording in Structure plan needs to capture; improved entrance to park, improved crossing safety (refuge) and connectivity.

Action: Officers to draft wording for Structure Plan.

- 14) All in agreeance that setbacks in Precinct 1 (Bay Road) will be increased from 3 metres to 6 metres.

Action: Officers to amend Structure Plan to reflect this.

- 15) All in agreeance that additional wording be added to the Structure Plan so that once the level crossing has been removed at Park Road, a further traffic study on the effects of the level crossing removal on traffic movement on road network will be undertaken.

Action: Officers to amend Structure Plan to reflect this.

- 16) All in agreeance that Pennydale section of Bay Road needs to be integrated with Southland and Sandringham sections, but recognise that the Structure Plan only deals with Pennydale.

- 17) All in agreeance that 'signalised intersection opportunity' will be changed to 'investigate need for signalisation' at Jack Road/Bay Road intersection on Figure 9, page 22 of Structure Plan. Need for signalised intersection at Park and Tulip Grove not needed now that Precinct 2 has been removed.

Action: Officers to amend Structure Plan to reflect this.

- 18) All in agreeance to remove "on-road" from page 24 regarding the provision of bicycle lanes on Bay Road. In addition:
- change strategy to Advocate to VicRoads to investigate ways to deliver the bicycle lanes along Bay Road.

- change Jack Road bicycle lane to 'investigate'.

Additional comments from PRAG:

1. PRAG: Need structure plan to say something about lane marking on Bay Road. The issue is that the current draft states formalise into a single lane. Vic Roads preference is for 2 lanes each way which is what is currently actually being used on the ground even though signage says 1 lane only. Changes in lanes mean changes in speeds and constriction of traffic. These things are what cause the majority of all accidents on roads. We need to ASK VicRoads what they can do to rectify this to the preferred 2 lanes, whether that means signage that says road narrows or just let it narrow.

Officer response: This is addressed on page 24 of the Structure Plan. The benefit of formalising the existing arrangement (one lane) is that it provides scope to increase the width of the pavement under the railway bridge, and also possibly deliver the first part of the Bay Road cycling path. Propose rewording existing Strategy to 'Advocate to VicRoads to formalise the traffic lanes along Bay road between the Frankston Railway Bridge and Jack Road. Either to reflect the existing arrangement (single lane in each direction), or two lanes.'

2. PRAG: Need to ensure the Structure Plan addresses the laneway from Siede Court to Bay Road.

Officer response: This is addressed on page 23 of the Structure Plan.

3. PRAG: please include moderate residential growth definition in amendment documentation.

Officer response: Agree.

Action: Officers to add definition of moderate residential growth to the amendment documentation.

4. Need to also include reference to possible pedestrian bridge across Bay Road- from last meeting.

Officer response: Agree.

Action: Officers to add reference to possible pedestrian bridge across Bay Road in Structure Plan.

3. Next Steps

Review Structure Plan and circulate with track changes end of Monday 30th July.

Group to circulate comments back by end of week (by Sunday 5 August).

Aim to commence consultation Friday 10 August 2018

END OF MINUTES



Minutes of the Meeting of Bayside City Council and Pennydale Residents Action Group

held in at Bayside Corporate Centre, 76 Royal Avenue,
Sandringham
on Wednesday 8 August 2018

The Meeting commenced at 4:00pm

PRESENT:

Hamish Reid	Director City Planning and Community Services
Juliana Aya	Manager Urban Strategy
Katanya Barlow	Principal Strategic Planner
Greg Scott	Pennydale Residents Action Group (PRAG)
Derek Screen	Pennydale Residents Action Group (PRAG)
Robert Saunders	Pennydale Residents Action Group (PRAG)

APOLOGIES

Julia Weyhe	Senior Strategic Planner, Bayside City Council
Patricia Smyth	Pennydale Residents Action Group (PRAG)

Table of Contents

1. Minutes of previous meeting
2. Options for moving forward
3. Proposed changes to Structure Plan
4. Next Steps

1. Minutes of Previous Meeting

Confirmation of minutes. Agreed by all. To be circulated to interested parties and be made available on the Have Your Say website.

2. Options for moving forward

Hamish Reid explained the options for moving forward. From the outset it was understood that we may not reach unanimous agreement, but that we would work together to see what could be achieved. Moving forward there are 3 options:

- a) Reach agreement - all agree on proposed changes to Structure Plan – consult with the wider community.
- b) Don't reach agreement – officers to go back to Council – proceed with Structure Plan as originally presented.
- c) Don't reach agreement – officers to go back to Council - abandon the process.

PRAG expressed desire to continue to work together to try and reach agreement. Hope abandonment is not an option.

3. Proposed changes to Structure Plan

Katanya Barlow took the group through the Structure Plan and proposed changes.

- Pg 7, Policy Context. PRAG concerned with reference to high density and Key Focus Residential Growth Area.

Katanya explained that this section is an explanation of the existing policy context. The Bayside Planning Scheme uses this terminology in relation to Pennydale.

Agreed that an additional paragraph would be added at the end of the 'Policy Context' section to explain that 'The role of the Structure Plan is to look at locally specific opportunities and constraints in Pennydale and determine what built form is appropriate in different locations. Given the design of the Southland station and the road layout in Pennydale, high density development (over 3 storeys) is not considered appropriate in Pennydale.

- Pg 8, Retail Services and Employment.
 - All agreed to delete paragraph referring to any westward expansion of Southland Shopping Centre. It is a hypothetical

situation. If it occurs in the future, it can be looked at as part of the review of the Structure Plan.

- All agreed to include explanation of why the Structure Plan includes bicycle lanes along Bay Road. 'Bay Road is identified in both State and local policy as part of the Principal Bicycle Network (PBN), as well as a Bicycle Priority Route and Strategic Cycling Corridor. The PBN is a network of existing and proposed cycle routes identified to help people ride to key destinations around Melbourne with a focus on getting people to and from activity centres and to make more use of local roads and off-road paths. Bicycle Priority Routes are priority sections of the PBN and identify routes that should be elevated to a higher order of priority. Strategic Cycling Corridors have been identified to help guide State investment in developing a network of bicycle routes that provide access to key destinations.'
- Pg 9, Vision. All agreed to add 'a range of *medium density* housing' to Vision to clarify that high density housing was not appropriate.
- Pg 11, 1st paragraph. All agreed to replace 'largely' with 'predominately'.

2nd paragraph- all agreed to remove '...as a result of the car park on the Laminex site'.

- Pg 13, last strategy under Objective 1 referring to rezoning 338 Bay Road. All agreed to remove strategy as this rezoning is being addressed through a separate planning scheme amendment (C126).

Last strategy under Objective 2. All agreed to reword to 'Encourage and support...'

Last strategy under Objective 3 referring to any future Southland Shopping Centre expansion. All agreed to delete as it is a hypothetical situation.

- Pg 14, 1st paragraph. All agreed to replace 'some' with 'formidable'. So will now read '....the design of the train station presents formidable barriers....'
- Pg 14, Precinct Table. All agreed to split Precinct 1 into two distinct Precincts, one precinct for Bay Road and one precinct for Park Road.

Bay Road Precinct description to read 'An area of medium density housing, where residential renewal and consolidation is encouraged

with high-quality, well articulated apartments set within a landscaped setting, that address Bay Road.

Park Road Precinct description to read 'A leafy gateway boulevard with a range of high quality, well articulated apartments surrounded by trees.

All agreed to remove Southland Station interface Precinct and instead include a new Strategy under Objective 5 'Should a new station entrance open at Tulip Grove, a review of the residential streets around the Station will be undertaken to determine what, if any, changes to built form and pedestrian access are required.

- Pg 17. All agreed to update this page to reflect changes agreed to above. In addition, front setbacks for Bay Road and Park Road Precincts to be increased from 3 metres to 6 metres. Side and rear setbacks for Park Road Precinct to be the same as Bay Road Precinct.
- Pg 19. All agreed to include a photo of a two storey town house as well as a 3 storey town house.
- Pg 20, all agreed to:
 - Objective 7, first Strategy. Replace 'require' with 'encourage'.
 - Objective 7, Include a new Strategy 'Ensure development provides articulated and well-designed facade, fenestration, parapet treatments and other detailing and materials to provide interest at street level and reinforce the human scale.
 - Objective 8, include a new Strategy - 'Within Precinct 5, ensure deep soil (at least 41 m³ of soil volume) is provided within the front setback to enable the planting of a 10 metre wide canopy tree.
 - Objective 8, include new Strategy 'Ensure new development is respectful of and does not detract from any adjacent heritage building.
 - Objective 8, include new Strategy, 'Encourage screen planting, including canopy trees, in rear setbacks of new developments to reduce the amenity impacts of new development and to provide a green and leafy setting'.
 - Objective 8, change wording of VPO strategy to reflect wording in Highett Structure Plan 'Investigate whether a Vegetation Protection Overlay or Significant Landscape Overlay is justifiable and appropriate for some or all of the residential areas of Pennydale'.
- Pg 23, all agreed to:

- Update 4th Strategy under Objective 9 to include reference to also connecting Pennydale to Sir William Fry Reserve and that the pedestrian access would ideally be in the form of a pedestrian overpass bridge. So will read '....connect the train station to Bay Road and Pennydale to Sir William Fry Reserve. This could be incorporated into the future shared path along the Frankston Railway line, ideally in the form of a pedestrian overpass bridge'.
 - Add a new Strategy under Objective 9 to 'Investigate options for improving pedestrian connectivity, safety and access to Cheltenham park. There should be a direct, legible path to the Cheltenham Park entrance from the pedestrian refuge on Park Road.'
 - Update 6th Strategy under Objective 9 to 'investigate the need for a signalised pedestrian crossing at Park and Jack Road.' Make the part of the strategy about LXRA a separate Strategy.
 - Update 1st Strategy under Objective 10 to 'Advocate to VicRoads to deliver the Bay Road Strategic Cycling Corridor by providing cycling lanes along Bay Road. These will connect to....'
 - Update 3rd Strategy under Objective 10 to refer to the possibility of a pedestrian overpass bridge '.....with local access to residential areas wherever possible, for example with the construction of a pedestrian overpass bridge across Bay Road.'
- Pg 24. All agree to:
 - Replace first Strategy on this page with 'Investigate ways to improve bicycle safety and amenity along Jack Road.'
 - Add a new Strategy under Objective 12 . 'Once the level crossing has been removed at Park Road, undertake a traffic study to investigate the impact it has had on traffic movement and the road network across Pennydale.'
 - Amend first Strategy under Objective 12 to 'Investigate the upgrading of the Bay Road/Jack Road intersection to a signalised intersection that includes the existing signalised pedestrian crossing in order to improve safety for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles using Bay and Jack Roads.'
 - Delete 3rd Strategy under Objective 12. Signalisation of Tulip Grove/Park Road not needed if Precinct 2 is removed.
 - Delete 4th Strategy under Objective 12. New rear laneways are not supported by the community.
 - Add new Strategy under Objective 12. 'Require shop-top development on Bay Road to provide access from the existing laneways to minimise vehicular crossovers and movements on Bay Road.'

- Pg 27. All agreed to reword legend to 'Possible Future Shared Zone' and 'Encourage natural surveillance of Open Space'.
- Pg 30. All agreed to include a new sentence. 'Should a new station entrance open at Tulip Grove, a review of the residential streets around the Station will be undertaken to determine what, if any, changes to built form and pedestrian access are required.
- All agreed that references to Precincts and Figures to be updated to reflect all changes agreed above.

Agreement not reached on boundary of Park Road Precinct or 3 storey street wall height for Park Road Precinct, or typologies for Bay and Park Road.

PRAG would like the Precinct boundary to be located between 119/125 Park Road and that there be a requirement that the 3rd storey in this Precinct be setback 3 metres. PRAG would also like to add townhouse typology to Park and Bay Road Precincts.

Officers do not think these changes are justified and would result in more stringent planning controls than currently exist.

Agreement also not reached about Strategy under Objective 12 that seeks to designate Jack Road as a Connector Street.

PRAG not comfortable with this designation as it is already a busy road. Officers explained Jack Road is already acting as a Connector Street. This designation reflects its existing use and function.

4. Next Steps

PRAG to consider their position on Park Road Precinct and get back to Council.

PRAG to consider their position on Jack Road being designated a Connector Street.

Officers to consider options for moving forward depending on PRAG feedback on the above two points where agreement has not yet been reached.

END OF MINUTES